Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*

Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066

VOL. VI, NO. 12, *Issue Number* 269, MARCH 23, 1949 ★ *Editors:* FELIX MORLEY & FRANK C. HANIGHEN

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA MAR 30 1949 LIBRARY

WHAT FOLLOWS THE UNITED NATIONS?

by Felix Morley

Adolph Hitler is often quoted as having said: "The bigger the lie, the better the propaganda."

There is no documentary evidence that the late unlamented Fuehrer ever put it quite that bluntly. But the idea undoubtedly was voiced by him in the chapter on "War Propaganda" in Mein Kampf. There Hitler discusses the effectiveness of English propaganda in World War I, which successfully put over such concoctions as the fable of the Germans boiling down their war dead to obtain essential fats.

Hitler admiringly describes this type of propaganda fabrication as: "a lie which by the absolute, colossal impudence of its presentation made allowance for the emotional and always extreme attitude of the common people, and therefore was believed".

The assertion that the biggest lies make the best propaganda comes naturally to mind as one examines the current effort of the Administration to prove that the pending North Atlantic Treaty "will strengthen and support the United Nations", to quote the words of President Truman.

Mr. Truman may quite possibly believe this. And it is further possible that a majority of the American people can be made to believe this. But it is certain that nothing is further from the truth.

II

HUMAN EVENTS, which is not interested in trying to fool anybody, could never force itself to be optimistic about the United Nations. On May 16, 1945, during the San Francisco Conference, we predicted that the unqualified right of veto would eventually wreck the organization. On July 4, 1945, when the Charter was finally completed, we called it "a constitutional monstrosity".

It would be more honest, and therefore more promising, if the Truman Administration would say courageously that the United Nations is now regrettably a demonstrated failure and that the United States is therefore building a military alliance against Soviet Russia as a temporary alternative. Nobody who has actually read the Charter of U.N. can really believe all this hypocrisy about the proposed treaty being merely a "regional arrangement" of the type which the Charter contemplates.

Copyright 1949 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And for the very good reason that it completely undermines the State Department case, Secretary Acheson must be very careful not to quote Article 54 of the Charter, which says:

> "The Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security."

The shrewd Mr. Vishinsky, now in complete charge of Soviet foreign policy, is in a position to have a good deal of fun with Article 54 of the Charter, by placing it in conjunction with Article 7 of the projected treaty, saying:

> "This Treaty does not affect, and shall not be interpreted as affecting, in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of the Parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security."

If words mean anything, and if there is any sincerity in governmental actions, it follows from these two articles that we must report to the Russian representative on the Security Council all the military measures "in contemplation" against Russia, as these are developed under the North Atlantic Treaty. It will be interesting to note the extent to which that solemn obligation is observed.

Article 5 of the proposed treaty is superficially clever. That is the article which contemplates a Russian attack on "one or more" members of the North Atlantic Alliance and provides for collective action in response. The second paragraph of this Article says:

> "Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security."

This paragraph of course anticipates a Russian effort, in the Security Council, to veto measures taken against Russia by the North Atlantic Alliance. The plan is to nullify the Soviet veto by declaring that this consideration by the Security Council is insufficient. The members of the alliance, though they are members of the United Nations, will pay attention to the supreme organ of U.N. only to the extent that the latter takes "necessary measures".

This can only be called direct effort, sponsored by the government of the United States, to undermine the United Nations as it is established. There is no attempt to define "necessary measures", or to say who shall decide what constitute "necessary measures". Again it appears that our government shamelessly intends to be judge in its own cause.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But in spite of this plan to circumvent the Charter, as approved by our Senate on July 28, 1945, with only two dissenting votes, there is plenty of scope for Russia to raise awkward questions about the projected treaty, through the machinery of the United Nations. There is now even less probability than before that Russia will abandon its membership in U.N. And the nuisance value of that membership is greatly increased by the establishment of U.N. headquarters in the United States, a most fatuous accomplishment for which our Department of State can also claim full credit.

III

All this is not said in criticism of the projected treaty. Since it will presumably be approved by the Senate, though without enthusiasm, it is desirable to say all that can honestly be said in favor of the pact. Measured against the succession of almost incredible blunders made by American diplomacy under Roosevelt and Truman, this treaty can be regarded as the only immediately practical way of saving something out of the wreck. But the treaty cannot be advocated on the basis of any other argument.

If the American people are wise they will view this awful situation with all the reasoning power which they can concentrate. Then we shall realize that we are asking for war with Russia, and that only restraint on the part of the Politburo will keep us from getting that war. Just as lend-lease meant war with the Axis, unless Germany and Japan were unwilling to accept our challenge, so this treaty means war unless Soviet Russia decides to knuckle under. The Communists, however, may for a long time refuse to pick up the gauntlet, because they have ways of waging war which are a great deal more subtle than those of military force.

As the cold war continues it would therefore seem practical to consider policies less crude and costly than this old-fashioned military alliance, in which practically all the bills will be paid by that patient beast of burden -- the American taxpayer.

Since this alliance clearly seeks to circumvent the United Nations, and will be hampered in operation by the parallel functioning of the United Nations, it would seem logical to admit this, officially and frankly, at some early date. Secretary Acheson says that the "understanding support of the American people" is essential to the success of his policy. The only way to get the understanding support of people is to be honest with them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When the United Nations has been scrapped -- in name as well as in deed -- a plan for some more promising form of international co-operation should be ready to take its place. The proposed alliance is certainly not that plan. It is at best an undesirable, unsatisfactory and uninspiring stopgap. But the alliance can be developed into something more promising.

One basic trouble with this alliance is that by its terms the American people abandon all control of their own destiny. If Russia and Norway go to war, we also go to war, regardless of whether or not Norwegian mistakes helped to provoke the conflict. As a long-range proposition that sort of situation is intolerable.

The only sure way to improve the arrangement, as matters stand now, is to begin to build some sort of federation out of the projected treaty. The American people cannot be expected indefinitely to finance, arm and support these bankrupt European States without to some extent controlling their policy. The only proper way to exercise that control is by establishing a representative form of international government, in which the American and Western European people alike have some say as to the disposition of their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor.

Luxembourg is to the United States about like Rhode Island to the Union as a whole; Norway may be said to compare with Maine; Belgium with New Jersey; England with New York and France with California, Pennsylvania or Ohio.

Federation with Western Europe on the basis of enlarging the American Union by bringing in these additional States would be in accordance with the material importance of the various sovereignties involved. And it would have the incidental, though enormous, advantage, of immediately vitalizing the doctrine of State's Rights, which is so basic to the preservation of our republican institutions. If France were a member of a North Atlantic federation it would properly insist on a large degree of autonomy in its domestic affairs. That would encourage Virginia, for instance, more resolutely to oppose the encroachments of centralized government. A larger federation could readily mean more home rule.

In his broadcast of March 18 Secretary Acheson asserted that "similarities" between the United States and its proposed allies in Western Europe "are not superficial, but fundamental". That may be questioned. But if the argument justifies a military alliance it also justifies a more satisfactory form of union, under which the power and arrogance of centralized bureaucracies would be reduced; not further increased.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) and foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VI, No. 12

UNIV. OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED MAR 1949

By Frank C. Hanighen March 23, 1949

COALITION: It was in a corridor outside the Senate floor. Several Southern Democratic and Republican Senators were chatting about the recent coalition in the filibuster conflict, and one expressed the wish that this coalition could be continued. "Here's the chance we've often wanted." The colloquy started as just a momentary flight of fancy, but soon it was suggested that in case such a "working coalition" really got under way, Majority leader Scott Lucas might be replaced by, say, Millard Tydings of Maryland. And then -- so ran the fancy free -- several chairmen of committees should be replaced by Republicans; for instance, Taft might take the place of Thomas, heading the Labor Committee.

We know one of the Republican Senators in the group who said that the project would be acceptable to him. But he hastened to add that the little conference in the corridor was only "jocular". When we related the anecdote to a former Senator, who knows the Upper Chamber well, he laughed the project off as "impossible". He asked: "How would they get a majority of the Democratic Caucus to okay such an arrangement? It's much more likely that the Southerners would recognize Taft as their floor leader." It is, however, significant that, even "jocularly", Senators should discuss such a project. It reflects a developing trend of thought in the country.

The mention of Lucas suggests that Senators are yearning for a return to the day -- ante Roosevelt -- when a Senate Majority leader was a spokesman for the Senate at the White House, instead of an agent for the White House in the Senate (as he has been since the Thirties). The old status was as it should be, Arthur Krock points out in the New York Times (March 20), and he reminds us that Congress should be a co-ordinate branch of the Government, not a branch subordinate to the Executive. This issue has a long history. Old observers on the Hill recall the day late in the Thirties when Roosevelt wrote the famous "Dear Alben" letter to his favorite Barkley; and how Barkley bested Pat Harrison for the post of Majority leader. But traces of Legislative independence remained, and in 1944 Barkley as Majority leader revolted briefly against a White House tax veto. This is an old struggle which might come to life again one of these days.

* * * * *

PROCONSULS: The wonders of the American imperium -- the strangest example in all history -- are too numerous to mention. Here in Washington, where proconsuls tarry, one hears many odd stories. For instance, the post of Ambassador to Russia is going begging, and there are no takers. Our professional proconsuls are unlike Anatole France's blase "Procurator of Judea"; they want to do a job and they do not relish sitting alone in the Moscow Embassy watching the snow fall. It is said that neither the ambitious Mr. Kennan, nor the aspiring Mr. Bohlen care to endure such ennui. As for the "fat cats", there are no eager beavers like Mr. Joe Davies, these days. Mr. and Mrs. Campaign Contributor from Missouri know that they wouldn't be able to exercise the task -- how grateful for the power-loving! -- of distributing American dollars to the Muscovite. Nor do they relish the possibility of being held, one dire day, as hostages for Ambassador Panyushkin. It looks as if the President will have to draft some reluctant general for the Moscow job.

On the other hand, the eagles of Washington do not yield a jot to the eagles of ancient Rome in the splendor of protocol. For instance, it is reported that Admiral

Copyright 1949 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Leahy will be named Ambassador Plenipotentiary to Spain, but will then retire after three months in favor of Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, who has been earnestly briefing himself for the job. The reason for the arrangement is this: the dispatch of Leahy, the President's own military adviser, to Madrid would help relieve the injured feelings of the Caulillo, who has resented keenly the absence of an American Ambassador at his court. After three months, presumably, the old Admiral will be glad to take a rest from protocol and Franco.

As for our Crown Colony, Germany, there is more serious talk. An inspector-general diplomatique has been sent to the Trans-Rhine territory. He is Mr. George Kennan, famed expert on how to "contain" Russia. Mr. Kennan has the reputation of being a complete empiricist in his thinking, but this time he is said to have embarked for the marches of the Empire with a strong pre-conception. It is persistently rumored that Mr. Kennan believes that we should pull out of Berlin and withdraw our troops to the Rhine -- in short, a retreating "containment". But those who hear things in the State Department say he would have to be very persuasive to sell this notion to Secretary Dean Acheson. Or any other notion, for that matter, on which the lofty Mr. Acheson hasn't sold himself.

* * * * *

THE NEXT VOTER: Last year, with a self-righteousness characteristic of the aged, we had some harsh things to say about youth. We recalled the days of our nonage when youth was quite properly against the "system". Alas -- so ran our maunderings -- youth is now on the side of the "system" -- the international totalitarian system and its various conspiracies. This week we must beat our breast and concede that the above sweeping judgment should be modified. For, into our crabbed hands, has fallen The Next Voter. This fascinating publication is edited and gotten out by the students of the Political Science Course at Brooks School, North Andover, Massachusetts. Reading it, we felt a thrill, a hope which we have not experienced for a long time. Often have we thought that American youth, after so many years under the system of Statism, will never be emancipated. Now we must revise such defeatism.

These kids (none of whom can be over 18) launched their March number with a violent, but very sound, attack on what we used to call "the treason of the intellectuals". They say: "The ideology and aims of Soviet Russia have undergone no change since the days of the Russian Revolution. We, and not the Russians, are to blame if we failed to understand it and to act accordingly. We, and not the Russians, are to blame for a 'peace', the psychological horrors of which are certainly not less gruesome than the physical horrors of warfare. . . . There is one class of people in every nation and in every age of whom we have a right to expect complete intellectual honesty. They are the scholars, the teachers, the philosophers whose lives should be devoted to the search for absolute truth, irrespective of consequences.

"Perhaps the greatest crime, in the historical and moral sense, of the Fascists and Communists is the perversion of scholarship and the prostitution of the intellect. The 'philosophers' of Fascism were in a sense greater traitors than the Hitlers and Mussolinis. The 'philosophers' of Communism or Socialism -- from Marx and Engels to Laski and the like -- deserve more blame than Lenin, Stalin and Henry Wallace. They, the so-called Scholars, have originated and propagated the ideas and theories of these new, deadly and poisonous non-God religions."

Space, alas, does not permit a full summary of the excellent things in this number of The Next Voter. Making Not Merely Gossip green with envy, it has produced a scoop about the "dishonesty" of UNESCO. Then, there's a spirited attack on the Uriah Heeps of the academic profession; an acid analysis of socialized medicine in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain; and a warning, too rarely uttered these days, that bureaucracy is the "Sworn enemy of every scholar". Good for you, colleagues!

* * * * *

COMMUNISTS: The following is for the addled pates of conservatives and "liberals" who still fail to recognize that Communist parties are not "parties" in the American sense of the word, but units in an international conspiracy. Also, it should be useful to Mr. McGohey, that District Attorney up in New York, who is preparing to prosecute the 11 Communist Party leaders. And incidentally we might recall that the House Un-American Activities Committee for years has attempted to inform the American people, by good documentary evidence, of the same thing. The passage is embalmed in a fascinating booklet, gotten out by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, entitled The Soviet-Yugoslav Dispute, being a collection of the texts of the letters exchanged by Stalin and Tito, which led to the famous break of last summer. In the letter of May 4, 1948, from Moscow to Belgrade, there is this:

"In their letter of 13 April 1948 Tito and Kardelj (Yugoslav Foreign Minister) wrote: 'We consider that he (the Soviet Ambassador), as an ambassador, has no right to ask anyone for information about the work of our Party. That is not his business.' We feel that this statement by Tito and Kardelj is essentially incorrect and anti-Soviet. They identify the Soviet Ambassador, a responsible Communist who represents the Communist Government of the USSR, with an ordinary bourgeois ambassador, a simple official of a bourgeois State, who is called upon to undermine the foundations of the Yugoslav State. It is difficult to understand how Tito and Kardelj could sink so low. Do these comrades understand that such an attitude towards the Soviet Ambassador means the negation of all friendly relations between the USSR and Yugoslavia? Do these comrades understand that the Soviet Ambassador, a responsible Communist, who represents a friendly power which liberated Yugoslavia from the German occupation, not only has the right but is obliged, from time to time, to discuss with the Communists in Yugoslavia all questions which interest them? How can they be suspicious of these simple elementary matters if they intend to remain in friendly relation with the Soviet Union? What price Ambassador Panyushkin? If he isn't gathering "information" here today, and if he isn't "discussing" with C. P. leaders "questions" of interest, wouldn't it be a surprise? At any rate, this document makes clear the price we would have to pay for "friendly relations" with the U.S.S.R., if the fellow travellers who criticize a tough attitude towards Stalin were to have their way.

* * * * *

BOOK POSTAL RATE: The Post Office has proposed sharp increases in rates for magazines, newspapers and books with resultant outcries of pain from publishers. Second class rates on magazines may be boosted as much as 300 per cent. Now, it is about time that the Post Office Department should begin to pay its own way, and certainly magazines and newspapers which depend heavily on advertising have been enjoying too long what amounts to a government subsidy, through low postal rates. However, in the case of books, we are impressed by a protest from the National Postal Committee for Books, representing book publishers and distributors.

The Committee says that the proposed postal increases, if they go through, will amount, in the aggregate, to more than 500 per cent (since 1942) on the first pound and 300 per cent on each additional pound. These are steeper than the rates not only for magazines but for catalogs and circulars. Books are classified merely as merchandise, as fourth class matter, and their occasional "public welfare function" is not adequately recognized. It is clear that such rates as mentioned above will do damage to education, to the readers of books and the exchange of ideas. The Committee concedes that the rate on books should be increased 25 per cent over last year, but believes -- rightly, we think -- that higher rates would discriminate most unfairly against the book business. This column fails to see why magazines are given a preferred status over books.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

Mirror for Americans: Japan, by Helen Mears. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. $3.50. Reviewed by William Henry Chamberlin.

The mirror which Miss Mears holds up for the contemplation of American policy toward Japan before, during and since the war is not very flattering. It shows a vast amount of ignorance and complacency, some unconscious hypocrisy and a remarkable ability to apply double standards of morals. Sometimes the author pushes her case a little hard and employs analogies which do not altogether stand up under the test of analysis. But there has been so little self-examination and so much self-righteousness in the American attitude toward Japan that a critical book like the one under review is well worth thoughtful attention. Among the points which seem to this reviewer well taken, and which certainly cut across popular misapprehensions, the following stand out: It was an axiom of wartime propaganda that the Japanese from the earliest times, like the Germans, had been a peculiarly aggressive and war-minded people, in contrast to the "peace loving" United Nations. But, as the author says, the only proof of "inherent" Japanese militarism is the unsuccessful campaign of Hideyoshi in Korea in the Sixteenth Century. And from the beginning of the Seventeenth until the middle of the Nineteenth Century Japan had the most pacific and unaggressive record of any people of comparable size. They locked themselves up in their islands, forbade their own people to leave or foreigners to enter and developed a curious type of static, shut-in civilization.

What awakened Japan from its self-imposed isolation (practiced while Britain, Spain, Portugal, France, the Netherlands and other Powers were building up vast overseas empires and America was spreading over a virgin continent) was our own Commodore Perry, knocking at the Japanese door with his "black ships". Miss Mears is on solid historical ground when she writes: "That modern, post-Perry Japan has been aggressive and expansionist is clear. It is equally clear, however, that pre-modern Japan was both pacifistic and non-expansionist."

The author draws a number of parallels between Japanese and Western methods of colonial conquest and development, which are not always to the disadvantage of Japan. The Japanese record in bringing material benefits to Korea and Formosa, not for altruistic reasons, of course, would certainly stand comparison with the French record in Indo-China.

Roosevelt and Churchill at Cairo spoke smugly of their determination to take away from the Japanese all the territories they had taken "by violence and greed", overlooking the pertinent fact that the building up of every colonial empire contained large elements of these qualities. Certainly the present situation in Indo-China and Indonesia does not suggest that all problems rooted in "violence and greed" found a happy solution with the defeat of Japan. Miss Mears finds another chink in America's moral armor when she offers this comment on the American policy of keeping troops in Korea in order to counteract the threat of Communism. "If it is necessary for United States 'security' to keep troops in Korea -- to maintain order, and hold Russia back, and 'fight the Communist menace' -- it was even more necessary for the Japanese to do these things, not only in Korea but in Manchuria and China."

And she discovers a beautiful example of the inconsistency of military occupation which is supposedly pursuing a reforming and educative character when she notes that on the same day on which he announced that "thought control and the abuse of education are no more" General MacArthur ordered the suspension of the teaching of Japanese history, geography and morals until old textbooks could be pulped and new ones prepared. This book should have wide circulation, although it may be too soon to knock down successfully all the idols of wartime propaganda.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED